

REMARKS

The application includes claims 1,2, 5-8, 11-16, 18, 22-25, 28, 29, 31, 33-36, and 39 prior to entering this amendment. The Examiner objects to claims 1, 12, 18, and 29 because of informalities. The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-16, 18, 20, 22-25, 28-29, 31, 33-36, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Parry (U.S. 2002/0196460). Applicant amends claims 1-2, 5-6, 12, 18, 22-23, 29, 31, and 33-34. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-16, 18, 22-25, 28, 29, 31, 33-36, and 39 remain after entering this amendment. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration.

Claim Objections

Applicant amends claims 1, 12, 18 and 29, which obviates the Examiner's objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-16, 18, 20, 22-25, 28-29, 31, 33-36, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Parry. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 1 further recites *receiving the Java applet from the remote device over the network with the first browser window, the Java applet including a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) server application that, when executed, downloads an archive file from the remote device and provides a second browser window access to at least a portion of the archive file responsive to one or more HTTP requests from a second browser window.* Claims 12, 18, and 29 recite similar limitations.

Applicant amends claims 1, 12, 18, and 29 to clarify the operation of the HTTP server application, particularly, that the recited HTTP server application, when executed, downloads the archive file from the remote device and provides a second browser window access to at least a portion of the archive file responsive to HTTP requests from the second browser window.

The Examiner alleges Parry's interactive Java application including compressed and uncompressed files discloses both the recited HTTP server application and the recited archive file. See, Final Office Action, page 3. Parry, however, does not teach or suggest retrieving the

compressed and uncompressed files from the web server 32 when the interactive Java application is executed as the claims require. See, Parry, page 4, paragraph [0040]-[0041], where a workstation 58 retrieves the interactive Java application along with the compressed and uncompressed files from a web server 32 and then executes the interactive Java application to access and manage print jobs stored in job retention of the printer. See, Parry, page 4, paragraph [0040]-[0041]. Since Parry retrieves the compressed and uncompressed files with the interactive Java application, not when the interactive Java application is executed, Parry does not anticipate claims 1, 12, 18, and 29, or their corresponding dependent claims.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure in Parry of providing the second browser window access to at least a portion of the archive file responsive to HTTP requests from the second browser window as the claims require. The Examiner argues interactive window 62 discloses the recited second browser window. There is no disclosure in Parry of the interactive window 62 providing HTTP requests to the recited HTTP server application in the first browser window, much less receiving any portion of the recited archive file responsive to any HTTP requests as the claims require. See, Parry, pages 4-5, paragraph [0041], where the interactive window 62 is created and controlled by the interactive Java application without mention of any HTTP requests. Put differently, Parry teaches an interactive Java application that, when executed, creates a control panel 80 from files included within the interactive Java application, and thus there is no disclosure of downloading archive files from a remote device when executed, nor of receiving or responding to HTTP requests as the claims require. Parry therefore does not anticipate claims 1, 12, 18, and 29, or their corresponding dependent claims.

Claim 1 further recites *serving, from the HTTP server application, at least one of the HTML based file or image file received from the remote device responsive to at least one HTTP request for the HTML based file or image file received from the second browser window*. Claims 12, 18, and 29 recite similar limitations.

Applicant previously argued that Parry did not teach or suggest the recited claim features. The Examiner contends that the execution of Parry's interactive Java application and subsequent creation and display of a control panel 80 teaches the recited serving. There is no disclosure in Parry, however, of the interactive Java application receiving or responding to HTTP requests, much less HTTP requests from another browser window as the claims require. See, Parry, pages 4-5, paragraph [0041], where the interactive Java application when executed creates the control

panel 80. Since Parry does not teach or suggest its workstation 58 serving out any information received from the web server 32, much less in response to the recited HTTP request, Parry does not anticipate claims 1, 12, 18, and 29, or their corresponding dependent claims.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all claims of the application as amended is requested. The examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP



Jeffrey J. Richmond
Reg. No. 57,564

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 224-2170